

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

1. Overview of Non-Final Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-18 are pending in the present application. Claims 6, 14 and 19-22 are canceled.

Claims 1-5 and 11-13 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Fukumoto et al (US 6,380,923; hereafter “Fukumoto”) in view of Mori (US 2003/0181817) and Vock et al. (US 2003/0163287; hereafter “Vock”).

Claims 7-10 and 15-18 rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Fukumoto as modified by Mori and Vock as applied to claims 1-5 and 11-13 above, and further in view of Grimes (US 4,414,537).

2. Prior Art Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With regard to claims 1 and 11, the Examiner alleges, *inter alia*, that:

- (i) Fukumoto and Mori generally teach the claimed finger-motion detecting unit, finger-motion signal transmitting unit and finger-motion signal receiving unit; and
- (ii) Vock teaches the claimed finger-motion transmitting unit.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

One aspect of the claimed apparatus for detecting finger-motion in a wireless manner is that a finger-motion signal transmitting unit attached to a user’s finger modulates a finger-motion

signal corresponding to the finger so that the modulated signal has information on which finger is moved, for which an ID of the finger is stored in the finger-motion signal transmitting unit.

In this respect, the Examiner appears to assert that Fukumoto's finger-ring-type sensor modules RI1-RI5 having light signal generators LD1-LD5 (FIGS. 1-2) correspond to the claimed finger-motion signal transmitting unit. However, the Examiner admits that RI1-RI5 do not perform functions that may correspond to those of the claimed finger-motion signal transmitting unit. Instead, it is alleged that a movement monitoring system (MMD) of Vock (paragraph 8-28) makes up for the deficiencies of Fukumoto because the MMD stores an ID of the object being monitored, and is adapted to store and transmit a motion signal.

However, Vock also fails to teach the functional aspect of the claimed finger-motion signal transmitting unit, because this reference does not disclose that an ID of the object being monitored is stored in the MMD so that the motion signal has information on which object is moved. An ID disclosed in Vock is clearly different from the ID of a finger which is used to determine which finger of a user is moved. The ID disclosed in Vock is only an interrogation device which interrogates the MMD and, as a result of the interrogation, receives from the MMD the motion signal generated by the interrogation of the ID. As this functional element of the claimed apparatus is not disclosed in any of the cited references including Vock, the claim should not be rendered obvious.

Since the MMD of Vock does not store an ID of a monitored object, there has not been any teaching, suggestion or motivation to incorporate the function of the MMD into RI1-RI5 of Fukumoto to achieve the claimed apparatus for detecting finger-motion in a wireless manner. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness cannot be established by the cited references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-4 and 12-13 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements.

With respect to claim 5, Mori is alleged to teach a coil unit that is configured to be wound about a finger, and a control unit (11A of Fig. 4) that is configured to be positioned on top of the finger in the form of a chip. However, as clearly shown in the same drawing, the coil unit of Mori is not configured to be wound about a user's finger, but only the adhesive 131 is configured to be wound about a user's finger. Thus, Mori does not teach the features of claim 5. Claim 5 should also be allowable at least due to its dependency.

Claims 19-22 are canceled in the previous Amendment.

Claims 7-10 and 15-18 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies and additionally recited elements at least because Grimes does not make up for the deficiencies of Fukumoto and Mori.

* * *

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Seunghee Park/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Seunghee Park
Registration No. 60,719

Date: July 28, 2009